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Assumptions

- People negotiate for limited resources
- People come into the conflict situation with particular styles and mannerisms
- Style of negotiation is determined by culture, personality, past history, how opposing party negotiates
- Face-to-face negotiation can be adversarial
Question

- Do the behaviour and/or attitudes change when using an ENS?
- If they do change, in what ways do they change?
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ENS Research

- Negotiations conducted in virtual environment (no ftf) with the use of an ENS
- Union-management collective bargaining case; 7 issues negotiated
- 6 systems; 3 with analytical support, 3 without analytical support
- Pre- and post-negotiation questionnaire
Questions on negotiation behaviours

- **Pre-Negotiation**
  - “How would you describe your approach to dealing with a conflict situation?”

- **Post-Negotiation**
  - “How would you describe your team’s (or your own, if you negotiated individually) approach to the negotiation with the other side?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern about own outcomes</th>
<th>Concern about other party’s outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushover</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninformative</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Deceptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Research Results

- 156 completed the negotiations; 72 in November 2003, 83 in January 2004
- Participants entered negotiations with a positive, problem-solving approach (high concern for others)
- After using an ENS the concern for others was maintained, and the concern for self increased
Counterpart’s behaviours

- “What can you say about your counterpart in the negotiations?”
  - Had high concern for others; somewhat more positive than their view of themselves
Friendliness of Negotiations

- “Based on the case description, how do you expect the negotiations to be: very friendly – very hostile?”
  - Mean score of 3.48

- “Would you call your negotiations with the other side: very friendly – very hostile?”
  - Mean score of 2.22
Analytical support (AS)

- The degree to which ENS are able to model the negotiation problem, identify decision variables, elicit preferences on possible outcomes, and use preference information to display ratings for packages.

- 34 used a system without analytical support; 122 used a system with some degree of analytical support
  - NB. Need to be cautionary in making comparative statements.
Difference AS makes in negotiation behaviour

- High concern for others’ interests is prevalent when using both types of systems
- Greater changes in types of behaviours occurred when using system without AS
- Personal assertiveness increased by .54 when using a system without AS and .29 when using a system with AS
- Negotiations using AS were more friendly
- Negotiators using AS feel more strongly in outcome being equitable for both sides
Negotiation Behaviour

- Informative
- Persuasive
- Honest
- Accommodating
- Cooperative
- Avoiding
- Fair
- Flexible

ENS without analytical support
ENS with analytical support
Dual Concern Model for ENS

- High Concern about own outcomes
- Low Concern about own outcomes

- High Concern about other party’s outcomes
- Low Concern about other party’s outcomes

- Without support
- With Support

- Avoiding
- Accommodating
- Informative
- Fair
- Flexible
- Cooperative
- Honest
- Assertive
- Persuasive
Conclusion

- Isn’t sufficient data yet to make conclusions about the impact of the different types of systems.
- Those negotiating were not representative of typical negotiators.
- Many different cultures involved in the negotiations.
- Changes noted in style indicate a move to greater concern for others’ outcomes and a greater concern for personal outcomes.